

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**January 6, 2012**

**I. Consent Calendar**

- Draft BOARS December 9, 2011 minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the minutes.

**II. Chair's Announcements**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates met on December 12. There was a presentation by Tom Adams from the California Department of Education on the Common Core standards that was similar to the one Chair Jacob reported about in the fall, and reports on the progress of the C-ID project and the implementation of SB1440. There was discussion of the changing role of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, now chaired by Vice Provost Rumberger; ICAS is proposing that ICAS interact more closely with the ICC. One new role of the ICC may be to assume some of CPEC's former responsibilities. ICAS has also developed a series of white papers for faculty to use in their higher education advocacy work.

The Academic Council met on December 14. Council adopted BOARS' [principles](#) regarding guarantees of admission to UC and deferred approval of BOARS' recommendation not to include voluntary self-identification of LGBT status on the application pending discussion by UCAAD. Council also approved letters to Vice Provost Carlson summarizing the Senate's [views](#) about the proposed new APM 668 (negotiated salary program) and its [views](#) on proposed revisions to APM 670 (the Health Sciences Compensation Plan).

President Yudof shared BOARS' final [resolution](#) on nonresident enrollment with the Council of Chancellors earlier this week, and the Provost is following up with individual campus data about nonresident admission. The President also briefed the Council of Chancellors about BOARS' concerns regarding the resources needed for admissions processing work.

The Office of Admissions has completed a draft final report to the Legislature on UC's implementation of AB 2302. It discusses the work of the transfer curriculum streamlining groups and BOARS' transfer admissions proposal.

**III. Consultation with the Office of Admissions**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*

UCOP will release final undergraduate application data to the public on January 12. UC received a record number of applications for fall 2012, a total 13.2% increase over last year, including a 19.1% rise at the freshman level and a 4.2% decrease at the transfer level. Applications to all

nine undergraduate campuses increased this year. UCLA led the way with 91,512 applications, the highest total of any American public four-year university.

The number of freshman applications from California residents increased by 9.8% this year. The academic profile of the resident applicant pool is similar to last year, but it is more diverse. Applications from all ethnic groups increased, and applications from under-represented minority groups increased as a proportion of the total pool. UC continues to receive more applications from Asian Americans than any other ethnic group. There were also slight increases in the proportion of first generation college applicants and applicants from high schools with low API rankings.

The number of domestic nonresident freshman applications rose by 50%, and the number of international freshman applications rose by 66%. UC's total enrolled nonresident undergraduate population is now 6.9%, still well below the Regents' systemwide goal of 10%.

Among residents, the number and proportion of high-income (>\$150,000) applicants fell from 21% to 18%, and the proportion of low-income (<\$50,000) applicants rose from 38% to 43%. UCOP considers these changes to be a reflection of both the poor economy and trends in the California high school graduate population as a whole. They also show that rising fees and other factors are not discouraging low-income students from applying to UC.

UCOP is also looking at data that attempt to capture changes in applicant behavior that may be an effect of the new admissions policy. A higher proportion of California public high school graduates applied to UC for fall 2012—21%, compared to 18.8% for 2011, and 17.4% for 2010—although it is not clear that this is an effect of the new policy, as CSU is experiencing a similar trend. UCOP was also curious to see if there was a disproportionate increase among applicants with certain academic profiles; however, there was little evidence of change in the proportion of applicants in a given GPA or standardized test score range, or with a given number of a-g courses.

The percentage of residents who took two or more SAT Subject tests decreased from 79% to 38%, so the elimination of the Subject Test requirement has had a clear and significant impact. It is not yet clear if this represents a new pool of applicants who would not have applied in the past, as envisioned by the policy change, or if it is simply a matter of students who would have applied not choosing to take the tests. The average number of UC campuses students applied to was consistent with past years, suggesting little impact from the \$10 increase to the application fee. The total number of applicants in the combined guaranteed pool (ELC or statewide) decreased by about 14%. The number of applicants with an ELC guarantee increased in both the ELC 1-4% and 5-9% bands. (UC calculates ELC status from data reported on the application, so these numbers may change after verification.)

Among nonresidents, there were large increases in the absolute number of applicants with very high GPAs and test scores. This increase to the overall quality and selectivity of the nonresident pool should ensure that all campuses can comply easily with BOARS' "compare favorably" policy.

Director Jeffery also announced that Berkeley has a new [financial aid program](#) intended to benefit middle class families. Berkeley's plan will use the same federal need methodology as the

Blue and Gold Plan to determine the expected parental contribution, but will cap it at 15% of “middle class” income (between \$90,000 and \$150,000, assets less than \$200,000) and supplement it with Berkeley’s own campus resources, including philanthropy and nonresident tuition. UCOP is also developing a plan to increase financial aid for middle income families at the systemwide level, based on an expanded Blue and Gold Plan.

The Office of Student Affairs has modified the ELC referral pool proposal based on discussions at the December 9 BOARS meeting, and is now prepared to share the final version with the admissions directors. The plan now includes all students in the referral pool, not just ELC students, and ELC student percentile rankings will be available.

**Discussion:** It was noted that UC appears to be offering an admission guarantee to 14.6% of California public high school graduates, quite a bit larger than envisioned by the new policy and is well above the 12.5% Master Plan goal. There are also 25,000 applicants with a statewide index guarantee who do not qualify for the ELC guarantee. These results are much different than what was projected. BOARS should study the extent of the overlap. BOARS also may need to consider recalibrating the statewide index.

It was noted that another explanation for the decreasing number of high income applicants could be that more high income students are opting for private education as UC tuition increases. A decreasing number of residents willing pay the UC sticker price also has budget and financial aid implications.

Members asked UCOP to disaggregate the nonresident academic profile data into domestic and international segments. The committee also wants to review the academic performance of applicants who took two or more SAT Subject exams compared to those who took none. Finally, members want to see if there are significant differences between the information students report on the application and the information verified by UCOP on the back end.

Members noted that the ELC referral pool will be a great opportunity for some campuses. It is important that it be voluntary, however, so it should be clear that campuses will not be required to accept students from the pool.

#### **IV. Member Reports – Preparing for 2012 Admissions**

BOARS representatives discussed the personnel and funding situation of their campus in relation to its ability to perform admissions processing work this year. BOARS alerted the President about specific campus concerns in December.

Berkeley has hired extra readers and feels prepared to manage the increased workload. Davis also has hired readers to help manage the workload and analytical staff to help interpret holistic scores from other campuses. The Irvine representative has been advocating for budget augmentations in a difficult funding environment. Riverside has received tentative approval for funding that will allow them to hire an additional 1.5 FTE. UCLA understands the enhanced role of admissions in the fiscal crisis and has provided its admissions office with resources for more readers. The outgoing UCLA admissions director also hopes BOARS will continue to advocate for maintaining higher standards for nonresidents. Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz are awaiting a

response to their budget augmentation requests. UCSD is concerned about added volume, but thinks it probably has sufficient resources.

## **V. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Amendments to SR 610 (residency)**

**Action:** BOARS endorsed the proposed amendments.

## **VI. Identifying Priorities for BOARS in 2012**

Chair Jacob asked members to identify their top BOARS priorities and agenda items for the remainder of 2011- 2012.

In February, BOARS will discuss the UC Online Education project and its implications for admissions policy—e.g., admissions to UCOE for non-UC students, possible limits to the number of units taken without a formal application to UC, and the marketing of UCOE as a transfer pathway to UC.

Other agenda suggestions included the extent to which the transfer application decline is due to the dramatic reduction in course offerings at the CCC; trends regarding SAT verbal and math scores of applicants; possible approaches, through policy or messaging, to stem the over-packing of adolescents' lives with college preparatory activities; how to better communicate the importance of depth over breadth; online education in secondary education; and the future of Transfer Admission Guarantees.

Finally, it was suggested that BOARS discuss the new [federal guidelines](#) on the voluntary use of race to achieve diversity in colleges and universities, which include granting preference in admissions to high achieving graduates of low performing schools. It was noted that UC's Comprehensive Review Principles address many of these.

## **VII. BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

- *George Johnson, Chair*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Nina Costales, High School Articulation Coordinator*

Monica Lin, Nina Costales, and BOARS Vice Chair George Johnson recently met with Kelly Schwirzke, Oasis Independent Study Instructor at the Santa Cruz County Office of Education to discuss issues around UC's online provider and course approval process. The meeting resulted in a new possibility for addressing the growing backlog of online provider applications.

Vice Chair Johnson noted that when BOARS established its [online provider and course approval policy](#) in 2006, it assumed that online providers would be as stable as other organizations with UC "program status," like, for example, AP and IB; however, the online world is more fluid, with frequent mergers and acquisitions involving companies UC has already approved.

Both faculty and UCOP are concerned mainly about whether the curriculum of an online course meets ‘a-g’ quality requirements. UCOP staff are skilled at evaluating courses for content to see if they meet ‘a-g,’ but like faculty, staff feel less qualified to evaluate the quality of individual companies. He proposed shifting the focus from providers to courses with the help of existing institutions, such as the California Learning Resource Network (clrn.org), which can help screen online providers and courses for quality.

Nina Costales added that the BOARS policy was established in part because schools were uncomfortable using the principal certification option for online provider and course approval, and wanted UC’s expertise and seal of approval. At the time, there were also far fewer online providers in the marketplace than today. She added that some providers are now using their UC program status to market their courses to other institutions without ever having submitted a specific course to UC. There are currently 18 providers approved for program status and 17 providers in the review queue.

More recently, CLRN has been charged with reviewing and rating online courses for their alignment to the State Common Core Standards as well as iNACOL’s Quality Standards for Online Courses. CLRN addresses questions and standards similar to the ones UC uses in its “a-g” course evaluation. CLRN is open to the possibility of including additional notation on its website regarding whether a course meets the “a-g” subject requirements. Schools are already looking to CLRN ratings when making principal certification decisions.

Monica Lin added that UCOP staff could begin to rely on the CLRN ratings to make the initial UC determination that an online course qualifies for “a-g” course review. Once online courses are certified by CLRN, UCOP articulation staff can then review any courses submitted by online providers. As such, the A&E subcommittee would no longer have a direct role in reviewing and approving providers or courses, although BOARS would maintain authority over the online course policy. Members supported the idea of having CLRN do a first pass on the evaluation, but they also want to make sure CLRN reviewers are paying attention to details and issues that are important to UC faculty.

Members noted that it would be useful to review academic outcomes of UC students who had taken online courses in high school compared to students who had not.

**Action:** The subcommittee will invite the director of CLRN to join a conference call meeting to discuss potential collaboration.

## **VIII. BOARS Transfer Subcommittee**

- *Bill Jacob, Chair*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

Associate Director Brick said UC wants to understand why transfer applications declined this year. He noted that there were dramatic increases in the two prior years, so the 2012 numbers are still higher than 2010 and 2009. He asked the Subcommittee to review current Senate Regulations around lower division transfer admission that may be outdated, particularly SR 476.B regarding a transfer student who was UC eligible as a freshman and returns to UC after attending a community college. Campuses want more flexibility than 476.B currently provides to

address a growing population of potential lower division transfers that includes international students.

UCOP has drafted a revision to the Admissions Evaluation Guidelines with new language addressing BOARS' desired changes to the "excess units" cap policy. The new language maintains the current 105 quarter/70 semester cap on transferrable units from a community college but makes it explicit that the cap also applies to lower division units earned at a four-year institution. A student who exceeds the cap and has coursework from a four-year institution would no longer be barred from admission automatically. This means that students who earn lower division units at both a four-year institution and a CCC are not automatically deemed ineligible, in contrast to students who attended only the CCC. Similarly, students who earn units during an education abroad program during their CCC years would not automatically be deemed ineligible. The changes also make it possible for a campus to accept a "reasonable" number of upper division units for transfer. A campus could still choose to bar or accept students who exceed the cap when upper division units are considered. The subcommittee supported the changes. Members suggested adding language stating that one semester of upper division coursework should not be an automatic barrier to transfer admission. It was also suggested that BOARS consult with UCEP about this latter change.

The Subcommittee also reviewed a revised transfer proposal that takes into account feedback and concerns expressed in the systemwide Senate review. It proposes a timeline for next steps that includes a goal of completing a systemwide review in the spring, in time for Council approval and an Assembly vote on June 6.

**Action:** Subcommittee members will review the document and forward suggested revisions to Chair Jacob.

-----  
The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Bill Jacob